Little Rock
Rogers
Jonesboro
Austin
MitchellWilliamsLaw.com

Mitchell, Williams, Selig, Gates & Woodyard, P.L.L.C.



Walter Wright, Jr. wwright@mwlaw.com (501) 688.8839

## C&H Hog Farms, Inc. (Newton County, Arkansas): Cross Motions for Partial Summary Judgment in Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission Proceedings

## 04/04/2018

The parties litigating the denial by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality ("ADEQ") of a Regulation 5 permit for the C&H Hog Farms, Inc. ("C&H") before the Arkansas Pollution Control of Ecology Commission have filed motions for either partial summary judgment or a response to such motion.

## The filings include:

- C&H's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
- ADEQ's Response to C&H's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
- Intervenor's Joint Response to C&H's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
- Intervenor's Joint Motion for Partial Summary Judgment

As previously noted, C&H filed a January 18th Request for Adjudicatory Hearing and Commission Review challenging ADEQ's denial of a Regulation 5 permit for a liquid animal waste management system at the company's facility located near the community of Mt. Judea in Newton County, Arkansas (see previous blog post).

ADEQ is a party to the appeal supporting its decision to deny the permit. Further, the Ozark Society, Inc. and three individuals filed a January 26th Motion to Intervene in support of the denial of the permit (see previous blog post).

C&H's Motion is based on certain facts it argues are not in dispute and states:

- The applicable laws and regulations provide for C&H's continued coverage under the expired General Permit.
- ADEQ's decision to not issue the Regulation 5 permit did not terminate C&H's continued coverage under the expired NPDES General Permit.

ADEQ's Response to C&H's Motion disputes certain facts and states:

C&H's coverage under the expired NPDES General Permit continues only pursuant to the
 Commission's stay of the Director's final permitting decision denying their individual permit.

 Before the Director's final decision to deny C&H's Commission Regulation 5 permit application, C&H's coverage under the NPDES General permit continued pursuant to Ark. Code. Ann. § 8-4-203(m)(5)(D).

The Intervenors argue in support of a Response to C&H's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and its own Motion for Partial Summary Judgment:

- Coverage exists under a General Permit only until a permitting decision is made on an individual permit application and not until a permit is granted.
- Coverage under a General Permit terminates when an individual permit is denied.
- C&H misconstrues the federal regulations requiring General Permit holders to apply for individual permits.

A copy of the parties' motions can be downloaded below:

<u>C&H Hog Farms</u>, Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment

ADEQ's Response to C&H's Motion for Summary Judgment and Incorporated Brief in Support

<u>Intervenors' Joint Response to C&H's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Intervenors' Joint Motion for Partial Summary Judgment</u>